arXiv:1304.3797v2 [math.AP] 24 Apr 2013

Uniform BMO estimate of parabolic equations and global well-posedness of the thermistor problem

Buyang Li * and Chaoxia Yang

Abstract

Global well-posedness of the time-dependent (degenerate) thermistor problem remains open for many years. In this paper, we solve the problem by establishing a uniform-in-time BMO estimate of inhomogeneous parabolic equations. Applying this estimate to the temperature equation, we derive a BMO bound of the temperature uniform with respect to time, which implies that the electric conductivity is a A_2 weight. The Hölder continuity of the electric potential is then proved by applying the De Giorgi–Nash–Moser estimate for degenerate elliptic equations with A_2 coefficient. Uniqueness of solution is proved based on the established regularity of the weak solution. Our results also imply the existence of a global classical solution when the initial and boundary data are smooth.

Keywords: Well-posedness, thermistor, degenerate, BMO, parabolic, A_2 weight

Contents

1 Introduction 2
2 Notations 3
3 Main results 6
4 BMO estimate of parabolic equations 8
  4.1 Local L^1 estimates 8
  4.2 BMO estimates via $\mathcal{L}^{1,1}$ 11
  4.3 BMO estimates via $\mathcal{L}^{2,1}$ 13
5 Hölder estimate of parabolic equations 16
6 The degenerate thermistor problem 17
  6.1 Preliminaries 17
  6.2 Construction of approximating solutions 19
  6.3 Existence of solution 23
  6.4 Uniqueness of solution 24
7 Conclusions 24

---

*Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, P.R. China.
`Email address: buyangli@nju.edu.cn`

1 Introduction

The thermistor problem refers to the heating of a conductor, with temperature-sensitive electric conductivity, by electric current. Let ϕ be the electric potential and let $\mathbf{E} = \nabla\phi$ be the electric field. The electric current $\mathbf{J}$ is related to the electric field via $\mathbf{J} = \sigma(u)\mathbf{E}$, where $\sigma(u)$ is the electric conductivity of the conductor, dependent upon the temperature u. The heat produced (per unit volume) by the electric current is given by Joule's law: $\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{J} = \sigma(u)|\nabla\phi|^2$, and the conservation of charge is described by $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0$.

Let Ω denote the domain possessed by the conductor. Based on the above formulations, the temperature u and the electric potential ϕ are governed by the equations

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\kappa(u)\nabla u) = \sigma(u)|\nabla\phi|^2, \tag{1.1}$$

$$-\nabla \cdot (\sigma(u)\nabla\phi) = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

for $x \in \Omega$ and $t > 0$, where $\kappa(u)$ is the thermal conductivity. In this paper, we consider the above equations with the Dirichlet boundary/initial conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} &u(x,t) = g(x,t), \quad \phi(x,t) = h(x,t) && \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } t > 0, \\ &u(x,0) = u_0(x) && \text{for } x \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

The mathematical expressions of $\sigma(u)$ and $\kappa(u)$ depend on the materials. For some semiconductors, the electric resistivity $\rho(u) = 1/\sigma(u)$ can be approximately expressed as [17]

$$\rho(u) = \sigma_0 e^{q/u} u,$$

and the thermal conductivity $\kappa(u)$ can be regarded as constant (independent of u). For metallic conductors, the electric conductivity and the thermal conductivity obey the Wiedemann–Franz law [20]:

$$\frac{\kappa(u)}{\sigma(u)} = Lu,$$

where $L = 2.44 \times 10^{-8}\mathrm{W}\Omega\mathrm{K}^{-2}$ is the Lorentz number. In general, the electric resistivity of metals increases as temperature grows. At high temperatures, the electric resistivity increases approximately linearly with temperature:

$$\rho(u) = \rho_0[1 + \alpha(u - u_R)],$$

where u_R is some reference temperature and α is called the temperature coefficient of resistivity. If the temperature does not vary much, the above linear formula is often used. More precisely, the electric resistivity is give by the Bloch–Grüneisen formula [29]:

$$\rho(u) = \rho(0) + A\left(\frac{u}{\Theta}\right)^n \int_0^{\frac{\Theta}{u}} \frac{s^n}{(e^s - 1)(1 - e^{-s})} \mathrm{d}s,$$

where A, Θ and $n \geq 2$ are all positive physical constants.

For both metals and semiconductors, the electric conductivity $\sigma(u)$ tends to zero as the temperature u grows to infinity. The elliptic equation (1.2) is thus possibly degenerate, which leads to severe difficulties for the analysis of the coupled system.

The non-degenerate assumption $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma(u) \leq \sigma_2$ is often used to simplify the problem. Mathematical analysis for such non-degenerate problem has been studied by many authors in the last two decades. Existence of weak solutions was studied by Antontsev and Chipot [6], Allegretto and Xie [4] and Cimatti [8]. With the same non-degenerate assumption, Elliott and Larsson [9] proved the existence of strong solutions for the 2D problem by using the energy method (and uniqueness follows). The 3D problem is much more difficult. To deal with the 3D problem, one has to fully explore and make use of the coupling of the equations. The milestone was acheived by Yuan and Liu [25, 26], who proved the existence of C^α solutions for the 3D problem by using the method of Layer potentials. Yin [27] obtained the same result by using the techniques of Campanato spaces. Their results imply the existence of classical solutions when the boundary and initial data are smooth.

Without the non-degenerate assumption, the problem becomes much more difficult. Xu [23] proved partial regularity of the solution, i.e. the solution is smooth in an open subset $D \subset \Omega$ whose complement $\Omega \backslash D$ is a set of measure zero. Later Xu [24] proved existence of solutions with bounded temperature when the boundary potential is small enough, i.e. $\|h\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))}$ is small enough. Hachimi and Ammi [11] proved existence of weak solutions by the monotonicity-compacity method. Montesinos and Gallego [18, 19] proved existence of "capacity solutions" by considering a new formulation with the transformation $\Phi = \sigma(u)\nabla\phi$. Uniqueness of the weak solution and existence of global classical solutions remain open. Overall, the main difficulty of the degenerate problem is the lack of a L^∞ bound for the temperature u.

In this paper, we overcome this difficulty by establishing a uniform-in-time BMO estimate for inhomogeneous parabolic equations with possibly discontinuous coefficients. Applying this estimate to the temperature equation, we obtain a uniform-in-time BMO bound of the temperature u, as a substitute of the L^∞ bound. Based on the BMO bound of the temperature, we further prove that the electric conductivity $\sigma(u)$ is a A_2 weight uniform in time. The Hölder continuity of the electric potential ϕ is then proved by applying the De Giorgi–Nash–Moser estimate for degenerate elliptic equations with A_2 coefficient. The Hölder continuity of the temperature is proved by using the Hölder continuity of the electric potential. Existence of a weak solution in a bounded Lipschitz domain is proved, and uniqueness of the weak solution is proved based on the established regularity of the solution. Our results also imply the existence of a global classical solution when the initial and boundary data are smooth.

For interested readers, we refer to [3, 5, 9, 14, 15, 28] for numerical methods and numerical analysis of the thermistor problem.

The rest part of this paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2 we introduce the notations to be used in this paper and in Section 3 we present our main results. In Section 4, we establish a uniform-in-time BMO estimate for the solutions of inhomogeneous parabolic equations, and in Section 5 we present Hölder estimates of parabolic equations in terms of the Campanato spaces. Based on the estimates obtained in Section 4 and Section 5, we prove global existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to the degenerate thermistor problem in Section 6. Conclusions are drawn in Section 7.

2 Notations

Before we present our main results, we define the notations to be used in this paper.

Let n be a fixed positive integer and let $B_R(x_0)$ denote the ball of radius R centered at the point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and for any $y \in \partial\Omega$, there exists a ball $B_R(y)$ such that through a rotation of coordinates (if necessary),

$$B_R(y) \cap \Omega = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in B_R(y) : x_n > \varphi(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1})\},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function. For a bounded Lipschitz domain, there exists a positive constant R_Ω and a finite number of balls $B_{R_\Omega}(y_1)$, $B_{R_\Omega}(y_2)$, $\cdots$, $B_{R_\Omega}(y_m)$ such that $\partial\Omega \subset \cup_{j=1}^m B_{R_\Omega/2}(y_j)$ and through a rotation of coordinates (if necessary),

$$B_{2R_\Omega}(y_j) \cap \Omega = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in B_{2R_\Omega}(y_j) : x_n > \varphi_j(x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1})\}$$

for some Lipschitz continuous function $\varphi_j : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$.

For any integer $m \geq 0$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $W^{m,p}(\Omega)$ and $C^{m+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ denote the usual Sobolev space and Hölder space [1], respectively, and let $C^{m+\alpha}(\Omega)$ denote the space of functions which belong to $C^{m+\alpha}(\overline{B})$ for any closed ball $\overline{B} \subset \Omega$. Let $C_0^{m+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ be the subspace of $C^{m+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ consisting of functions vanishing on the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

Let $|D|$ denote the Lebesgue measure for any measurable subset D of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and let $B_R(x_0)$ denote the ball of radius R centered at the point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We say that a positive locally integrable function w defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a A_2 weight if

$$\sup_{B \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{1}{|B|} \int_B w(x) \mathrm{d}x \right) \left(\frac{1}{|B|} \int_B \frac{1}{w(x)} \mathrm{d}x \right) \leq C$$

for some positive constant C, where the supremum extends over all balls in B in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

For any measurable subset D of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we let $f_D = \frac{1}{|D|} \int_D f(x) \mathrm{d}x$ denote the average of f over D. For $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, let $L^{p,\theta}(\Omega)$ denote the Morrey space of measurable functions f such that

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\theta}(\Omega)} := \sup_{B_R(x_0)} \left(\frac{1}{R^{n\theta}} \int_{B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega} |f(x)|^p \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty,$$

where the supremum above extends over all balls $B_R(x_0)$ with $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $0 < R < R_\Omega$. For $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $1 \leq \theta < \infty$, let $\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}(\Omega)$ denote the Campanato space of functions bounded (or vanishing for $\theta > 1$) on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, equipped with the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}(\Omega)} : = & \sup_{B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega} \left(\frac{1}{R^{n\theta}} \int_{B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega} |f(x)|^p \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & + \sup_{B_R(y_0) \cap \Omega} \left(\frac{1}{R^{n\theta}} \int_{B_R(y_0) \cap \Omega} |f(x) - f_{B_R(y_0) \cap \Omega}|^p \mathrm{d}x \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum above extends over all balls with $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $y_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < R < R_\Omega$, and we set $\overline{\mathrm{BMO}} = \mathcal{L}^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

For any fixed $T > 0$, we set $\Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T]$ and $\Gamma_T = \partial\Omega \times (0, T]$. For any point $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we set $Q_R(x_0, t_0) = B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$ as the parabolic cylinder centered at (x_0, t_0) of radius R. For integers $m, n \geq 0$, $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and any open subset $Q \subset \Omega_T$, let $C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})$ denote the anistropic Hölder space of functions, equipped with the norm $\|f\|_{C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})} := \|f\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + |f|_{C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})}$, where

$$|f|_{C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})} = \sum_{|\gamma|=m} \sup_{\substack{(x,t)\in Q \\ (y,s)\in Q}} \frac{|D_x^\gamma f(x,t) - D_x^\gamma f(y,s)|}{|x-y|^\alpha + |t-s|^\beta}$$
$$+ \sum_{|\gamma|=n} \sup_{\substack{(x,t)\in Q \\ (y,s)\in Q}} \frac{|D_t^\gamma f(x,t) - D_t^\gamma f(y,s)|}{|x-y|^\alpha + |t-s|^\beta},$$

and set $C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega}_T) = C^{\alpha,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}_T)$. Let $C_0^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})$ denote the subspace of $C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})$ with functions vanishing on the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let $C^\infty(\overline{Q})$ denote the space of functions whose partial derivatives up to all orders are uniformly continuous on $\overline{Q}$. Let $C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\Omega_T)$ and $C^\infty(\Omega_T)$ denote the space of functions which are in $C^{m+\alpha,n+\beta}(\overline{Q})$ and $C^\infty(\overline{Q})$ for any closed cylinder $\overline{Q} \subset \Omega_T$, respectively. For any measurable subset Q of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and any integrable function f defined on Q, we let $|Q|$ denote the Lebesgue measure of Q and let $f_Q = \frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q f(x)\mathrm{d}x$ denote the average of f over Q. Analogous to the Morrey space $L^{p,\theta}(\Omega)$ and the Campanato space $\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}(\Omega)$, for $1 \leq p < \infty$ we can define the parabolic Morrey space $L^{p,\theta}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)$ equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\theta}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} = \sup_{Q_R}\left(\frac{1}{R^{(n+2)\theta}}\int_{Q_R}|f(x)|^p\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \qquad 0 \leq \theta \leq 1,$$

and the parabolic Campanato space $\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)$ of functions vanishing on the boundary Γ_T, equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} := \sup_{Q_R(x_0,t_0)\cap\Omega_T}\left(\frac{1}{R^{(n+2)\theta}}\int_{Q_R(x_0,t_0)\cap\Omega_T}|f(x)|^p\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$
$$+ \sup_{Q_R(y_0,s_0)\cap\Omega_T}\left(\frac{1}{R^{(n+2)\theta}}\int_{Q_R(y_0,s_0)\cap\Omega_T}|f(x) - f_{Q_R}|^p\mathrm{d}x\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where the supremums above extend over all cylinders with $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $y_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0, s_0 \in (0, T]$ and $0 < R < R_\Omega$.

For any Banach space X and time interval $(t_1, t_2) \subset \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $L^p((t_1, t_2); X)$ the Bochner space equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L^p((t_1,t_2);X)} = \begin{cases} \left(\displaystyle\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\|f(t)\|_X^p dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & 1 \leq p < \infty, \\ \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(t_1,t_2)} \|f(t)\|_X, & p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

The importance of the (parabolic) Morrey spaces is that $L^{p,\theta}(\Omega)$ translates just like $L^{p/(1-\theta)}(\Omega)$, i.e. through the transformation $\tilde{f}(y) = f(Ry)$ we have

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\theta}(B_R)} = R^{n(1-\theta)/p}\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^{p,\theta}(B_1)},$$

just like

$$\|f\|_{L^{p/(1-\theta)}(B_R)} = R^{n(1-\theta)/p}\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^{p/(1-\theta)}(B_1)},$$

for any ball $B_R \subset \Omega$. Similarly, $L^{p,\theta}_{\rm para}(\Omega_T)$ translates just like $L^{p/(1-\theta)}(\Omega_T)$. Therefore, $L^{p,\theta}(\Omega)$ and $L^{p,\theta}_{\rm para}(\Omega_T)$ can be used as substitute for $L^{p/(1-\theta)}(\Omega)$ and $L^{p/(1-\theta)}(\Omega_T)$, respectively, with lower order integrability. The importance of the (parabolic) Campanato spaces includes:

(1) $\mathcal{L}^{p,1}(\Omega)$ are equivalent for all $1 \le p < \infty$, i.e. $\mathcal{L}^{p,1}(\Omega) \cong \overline{\rm BMO}$;
(2) If $1 < \theta < (n+p)/n$, then $\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}(\Omega) \cong C^\alpha_0(\overline{\Omega})$ for $\alpha = n(\theta-1)/p$.
(3) If $1 < \theta < (n+2+p)/(n+2)$, then $\mathcal{L}^{p,\theta}_{\rm para}(\Omega_T) \cong C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}_0(\overline{\Omega}_T)$ for $\alpha = (n+2)(\theta-1)/p$.

These properties of the Morrey and Campanato spaces can be found in [7, 21].

In this paper, we let $C_{p_1,p_2,\cdots,p_m}$ denote a generic positive constant which depends on the parameters $p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_m$.

3 Main results

First, we establish a uniform-in-time BMO estimate and a Hölder estimate for the solution of the parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla\cdot(A\nabla u) = \nabla\cdot\vec{f} + f_0, & \text{in } \ \Omega\times(0,T), \\ u = g & \text{on } \ \partial\Omega\times(0,T), \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x) & \text{for } \ x\in\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $A(x,t) = [A_{ij}(x,t)]_{n\times n}$ is a symmetric positive definite measurable matrix function defined on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$K^{-1}|\xi|^2 \le \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}(x,t)\xi_i\xi_j \le K|\xi|^2, \quad \text{for all } \xi\in\mathbb{R}^n \tag{3.2}$$

holds almost everywhere for $(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, where K is a positive constant.

Theorem 3.1 (BMO and Hölder estimates of parabolic equations)
There exist positive constants C and $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ depending only on the elliptic constant K, the domain Ω and the dimension n (independent of T), such that the solution of (3.1) satisfies the BMO estimate

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);\overline{\rm BMO})} \le C(\|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)} + \|\vec{f}\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)} + \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}). \tag{3.3}$$

If the compatibility condition $u_0(x) = g(x,0)$ for $x\in\partial\Omega$ is satisfied, then we have

$$\|u\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C(\|f_0\|_{L^{1,(n+\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)} + \|\vec{f}\|_{L^{2,(n+2\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)} + \|u_0\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} + \|g\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\Gamma_T)}), \tag{3.4}$$

for $0 < \alpha \le \alpha_0$.

The inequality (3.3) is new. A similar inequality as (3.4) was proved in [27], where $\|f_0\|_{L^{1,(n+\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}$ was replaced by $\|f_0\|_{L^{2,(n-2+2\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}$. Note that $L^{2,(n-2+2\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)$ translates in the same way as $L^{1,(n+\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)$ under a scale transformation but requires higher integrability.

Secondly, by applying Theorem 3.1, we prove global existence and uniqueness of a weak solution for the degenerate thermistor problem under the following physical hypotheses:

(H1) The thermal conductivity is a smooth function of temperature and satisfies that

$$0 < \inf_{s \geq r} \kappa(s) \leq \sup_{s \geq r} \kappa(s) < \infty, \quad \text{for any fixed } r > 0.$$

(H2) The electric resistivity $\rho(u) = 1/\sigma(u)$ is a smooth function of temperature such that for some $p > 0$ there holds

$$C_{1,r} + C_{2,r} s^p \leq \rho(s) \leq C_{3,r} + C_{4,r} s^p \quad \forall\ s \geq r > 0, \tag{3.5}$$

where $C_{i,r}$, $i = 1, \cdots, 5$, are some positive c onstants (possibly depending on r).

Clearly, the hypotheses (H1)-(H2) are true for metals and some semiconductors. In particular, the electric resistivity $\rho(u)$ can be any polynomials which are positive for $u > 0$. The hypotheses (H1)-(H2) also imply that for any given $r > 0$, $\sigma(s)$ is bounded for $s \geq r$.

Theorem 3.2 (Global well-posedness of the degenerate thermistor problem) *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ $(n = 2, 3)$ and let $q_0 > n$. Assume that $u_0 \in W^{1,q_0}(\Omega)$, $g \in L^\infty((0,T); W^{1,q_0}(\Omega))$, $\partial_t g \in L^\infty((0,T); L^{q_0}(\Omega))$, $h \in L^\infty((0,T); W^{1,q_0}(\Omega))$, with*

$$\min_{(x,t) \in \Gamma_T} g(x,t) > 0, \qquad \min_{x \in \Omega} u_0(x) > 0,$$

and $g(x,0) = u_0(x)$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$. Then, under the hypothesis (H1)-(H2)*, the initial-boundary value problem* (1.1)-(1.3) *admits a unique weak solution (u, ϕ) such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &u \in C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T) \cap L^p((0,T); W^{1,q}(\Omega)), \quad \phi \in L^\infty((0,T); W^{1,q}(\Omega)), \\ &\partial_t u \in L^p((0,T); W^{-1,q}(\Omega)), \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

for some $q > n$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and any $1 < p < \infty$, in the sense that the equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_\Omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} v \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \kappa(u) \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \sigma(u) |\nabla \phi|^2 v \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t, \\ &\int_0^T \int_\Omega \sigma(u) \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \varphi \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t = 0, \end{aligned}$$

hold for any $v, \varphi \in L^2((0,T); H_0^1(\Omega))$.

Note that with the regularity (3.6), the last equation above is equivalent to

$$\int_\Omega \sigma(u) \nabla \phi \cdot \nabla \varphi \,\mathrm{d}x = 0, \quad \forall\ \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0,T).$$

4 BMO estimate of parabolic equations

The solution of (3.1) can be decomposed into three parts, i.e. the solution of the following three problems:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (A\nabla u) = f_0, & \text{in } \ \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \ \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ u(x,0) = 0 & \text{for } \ x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (A\nabla u) = \nabla \cdot \vec{f}, & \text{in } \ \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \ \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ u(x,0) = 0 & \text{for } \ x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (A\nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \ \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = g & \text{on } \ \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x) & \text{for } \ x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

From the maximum principle and the De Giorgi–Nash–Moser estimates, we know that there exist positive constants C and $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$ such that the solution of (4.3) satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} \le \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \\ &\|u\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C(\|g\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Gamma}_T)} + \|u_0\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})}), \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0 < 1$ and $T > 0$ (the second inequlaity above requires the compatability condition). To prove Theorem 3.1, it suffices to present estimates for the equations (4.1)-(4.2).

The rest part of this section is organized in the following way. In Section 4.1, we present local L^1 estimates for the solution to (4.1). In Section 4.2, we combine the local L^1 estimates to derive a global BMO estimate based on the equivalence of $\overline{\text{BMO}}$ with the Campanato space $\mathcal{L}^{1,1}(\Omega)$. In Section 4.3, we establish the BMO estimate for (4.2) in terms of the Campanato space $\mathcal{L}^{2,1}(\Omega)$.

4.1 Local L^1 estimates

In this subsection, we present local L^1 estimates for the solution of (4.1). The estimates obtained in this subsection will be used in Section 4.2 to derive a global BMO estimate uniformly with respect to time.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < t_0 < T$. There exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ such that if u is the solution of (4.1) in $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times I_R$ with $I_R = (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, then*

$$\max_{t\in I_\rho} \|u - u_{Q_\rho}\|_{L^1(B_\rho)} \le C\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+\alpha_0} \max_{t\in I_R} \|u - \theta\|_{L^1(B_R)} + C\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}$$

holds for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{t_0})$ and any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, where the constants C and α_0 depend only on K and n.

Proof First, we prove the lemma for $\theta = 0$. Let $\widetilde{B}_r = B_r(0)$, $\widetilde{I}_r = (-r^2, 0]$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}_r = \partial \widetilde{B}_r \times \widetilde{I}_r$. With any function ξ defined on Q_R, we associate a function $\tilde{\xi}(y, s) = \xi(x_0 + Ry, t_0 + R^2 s)$ defined on $\widetilde{Q}_1 := \widetilde{B}_1 \times \widetilde{I}_1$. Then $\tilde{u}$ is a solution to the equation

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A} \nabla_y \tilde{u}) = R^2 \tilde{f}_0$$

in $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Let w be the solution of

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A} \nabla_y w) = R^2 \tilde{f}_0$$

with the boundary/initial condition $w = 0$ on the parabolic boundary $\partial_{\mathrm{p}} \widetilde{Q}_1$ and let $\bar{w}$ be the solution of

$$\frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A} \nabla_y \bar{w}) = R^2 |\tilde{f}_0| 1_{\widetilde{Q}_1}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with the initial condition $\bar{w}(y, 0) \equiv 0$. By the maximum principle, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} &|w(y,s)| \le |\bar{w}(y,s)| \\ &\le \int_0^s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{C}{(s-s')^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{|y-y'|^2}{C(s-s')}} R^2 |\tilde{f}_0(y', s')| 1_{\widetilde{Q}_1}(y', s') \mathrm{d}y' \mathrm{d}s'. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the $L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)$ norm with respect to y, we derive that

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(\widetilde{I}_1; L^1(\widetilde{B}_1))} \le C R^2 \|\tilde{f}_0\|_{L^1(\widetilde{Q}_1)}.$$

We note that $v = \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1} - w$ is the solution of

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A} \nabla_y v) = 0$$

in $\widetilde{Q}_1$, and by the De Giorgi–Nash estimates of parabolic equations we know that there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_\rho} \frac{1}{\rho^{n+\alpha_0}} \int_{\widetilde{B}_\rho} |v - v_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}| \mathrm{d}y \\ &\le C |v|_{C^{\alpha_0, \alpha_0/2}(\widetilde{Q}_{1/2})} \le C \|v\|_{L^1(\widetilde{Q}_1)} \le C \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_1} \|v\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_\rho} \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_\rho)} \\ &\le \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_\rho} \|v - v_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_\rho)} + \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_\rho} \|w - w_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_\rho)} \\ &\le C \rho^{n+\alpha_0} \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_1} \|v\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)} + C \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_1} \|w\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)} \\ &\le C \rho^{n+\alpha_0} \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_1} \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)} + C \max_{t \in \widetilde{I}_1} \|w\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\rho^{n+\alpha_0}\max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1}\|\tilde{u}-\tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)}+CR^2\|\tilde{f}_0\|_{L^1(\widetilde{Q}_1)}\\
&\leq C\rho^{n+\alpha_0}\max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1}\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)}+CR^2\|\tilde{f}_0\|_{L^1(\widetilde{Q}_1)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have noted that

$$
\|\widetilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)}=\frac{|\widetilde{B}_1|}{|\widetilde{Q}_1|}\int_{\widetilde{Q}_1}|\widetilde{u}|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t\leq\max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1}\|\widetilde{u}\|_{L^1(\widetilde{B}_1)}.
$$

Transforming back to the (x,t)-coordinates, we complete the proof of the Lemma. for $\theta=0$.

Then we note that $u-\theta$ is also a solution to the equation (4.1) in Q_R for any $\theta\in\mathbb{R}$. ☐

Similarly, we can prove the following local L^1 estimates near the boundary $\partial_p\Omega_T$.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $x_0\in\Omega$ and $t_0=0$. There exists $\alpha_0\in(0,1)$ and $C>0$ such that if u is the solution of* (4.1) *in $Q_R=B_R(x_0)\times\underline{I}_R$ with $\underline{I}_R=[0,R^2]$, then*

$$
\max_{t\in\underline{I}_\rho}\|u\|_{L^1(B_\rho)}\leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+\alpha_0}\max_{t\in\underline{I}_R}\|u\|_{L^1(B_R)}+C\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}
$$

holds for any $0<\rho\leq R\leq\min(\mathrm{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega),\sqrt{T})$, where the constants C and α_0 depend only on K and n.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $x_0\in\partial\Omega$ and $t_0>0$. There exists $\alpha_0\in(0,1)$ and $C>0$ such that if u is the solution of* (4.1) *in $Q_R=B_R\times I_R$, with $B_R=B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega$ and $I_R=(t_0-R^2,t_0]$, then*

$$
\max_{t\in I_\rho}\|u\|_{L^1(B_\rho)}\leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+\alpha_0}\max_{t\in I_R}\|u\|_{L^1(B_R)}+C\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}
$$

holds for any $0<\rho\leq R\leq\min(R_\Omega,\sqrt{t_0})$, where the constants C and α_0 depend only on K, n and Ω.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $x_0\in\partial\Omega$ and $t_0=0$. There exists $\alpha_0\in(0,1)$ and $C>0$ such that if u is the solution of* (4.1) *in $Q_R=B_R\times I_R$, with $B_R=B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega$ and $I_R=[0,R^2]$, then*

$$
\max_{t\in I_\rho}\|u\|_{L^1(B_\rho)}\leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+\alpha_0}\max_{t\in I_R}\|u\|_{L^1(B_R)}+C\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)},
$$

holds for any $0<\rho\leq R\leq\min(R_\Omega,\sqrt{T})$, where the constants C and α_0 depend only on K, n and Ω.

The following simple lemma can be found in [7, 16], which is widely used for estimates in terms of the Morrey and Campanato spaces.

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\varphi(\cdot)$ be a nonnegative and nondecreasing function defined on $(0,R_0]$ and suppose that for any $0<\rho\leq R\leq R_0$,*

$$
\varphi(\rho)\leq C_1\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{\gamma_1}\varphi(R)+C_2R^{\gamma_2},
$$

where C_1, γ_1 and γ_2 are nonnegative constants such that $0<\gamma_2<\gamma_1$. Then

$$
\frac{1}{R^{\gamma_2}}\varphi(R)\leq C_{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,C_1}\left(\frac{1}{R_0^{\gamma_2}}\varphi(R_0)+C_2\right).
$$

From the above lemmas, we obtain the following local L^1 estimates.

Proposition 4.6 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 > 0$ and $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times I_R$ with $I_R = (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^n}\|u - u_{Q_\rho}\|_{L^\infty((t_0-\rho^2,t_0);L^1(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^1(B_R))} + \|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)$$

for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min\bigl(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{t_0}\bigr)$.

Proposition 4.7 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 = 0$ and $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times [0, R^2]$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-\rho^2,t_0);L^1(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^1(B_R))} + \|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)$$

for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min\bigl(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{T}\bigr)$.

Proposition 4.8 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 > 0$ and $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times I_R$ with $I_R = (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-\rho^2,t_0);L^1(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^1(B_R))} + \|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)$$

for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{t_0})$.

Proposition 4.9 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 = 0$ and $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times [0, R^2]$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,\rho^2);L^1(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R^2);L^1(B_R))} + \|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)$$

for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{T})$.

4.2 BMO estimates via $\mathcal{L}^{1,1}$

We combine the local L^1 estimates obtained in the last subsection to derive a global BMO estimate of u, uniform with respect to time.

Proposition 4.10 *The Propositions 4.6–4.9 imply that the solution of (4.1) satisfies that*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);\overline{\mathrm{BMO}})} \le C\|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}, \tag{4.4}$$

where C depends only on K, n and Ω (independent of T).

Proof Set $M = \|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}$.

First, we prove the proposition for $T \ge R_\Omega^2$. We shall prove that for $R < R_\Omega/2$ and any set $B_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega$ with some point $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $\delta = \mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega)$, the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(B_R))} \le C\bigl(\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} + M\bigr), & \text{if } \delta \le R, \\ \frac{1}{R^n}\|u - u_{B_R}\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(B_R))} \le C\bigl(\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} + M\bigr), & \text{if } \delta > R, \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

Case 1: $\delta \le R$. In this case, there exists a region $B_{2R} = B_{2R}(y_0) \cap \Omega$ with some $y_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $B_R \subset B_{2R}$ and so, for any given $t_0 \in [0,T]$,

$$\|u(\cdot,t_0)\|_{L^1(B_R)} \le \|u(\cdot,t_0)\|_{L^1(B_{2R})}. \tag{4.6}$$

Now if $t_0 \le 4R^2$, then by Proposition 4.9,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{R^n}\|u(\cdot,t_0)\|_{L^1(B_{2R})} \le \|u\|_{L^\infty((0,4R^2);L^1(B_{2R}))} \\ &\le C\left(\frac{1}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R_\Omega^2);L^1(B_{R_\Omega}))} + M\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Otherwise, $t_0 > 4R^2$ and by Proposition 4.8, for $R_0 = \min(\sqrt{t_0}, R_\Omega)$ and $R_m = \max(\sqrt{t_0}, R_\Omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-4R^2,t_0);L^1(B_{2R}))} \\ &\le C\left(\frac{1}{R_0^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R_0^2,t_0);L^1(B_{R_0}))} + M\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} C\left(\frac{1}{t_0^{n/2}}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,t_0);L^1(B_{\sqrt{t_0}}))} + M\right), & \sqrt{t_0} < R_\Omega, \\ C\left(\frac{1}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R_\Omega^2,t_0);L^1(B_{R_\Omega}))} + M\right), & \sqrt{t_0} \ge R_\Omega. \end{cases} \\ &\le \begin{cases} C\left(\frac{1}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R_\Omega);L^1(B_{R_\Omega}))} + M\right), & \sqrt{t_0} < R_\Omega, \quad \text{(by Proposition 4.9)} \\ C\left(\frac{1}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R_\Omega^2,t_0);L^1(B_{R_\Omega}))} + M\right), & \sqrt{t_0} \ge R_\Omega. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, for $\delta \le R$ and $t_0 \in [0,T]$ we have

$$\frac{1}{R^n}\|u(\cdot,t_0)\|_{L^1(B_R)} \le \frac{C}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} + CM. \tag{4.8}$$

Case 2: $\delta > R$. In this case, we set $R_0 = \min(\delta, \sqrt{t_0}, R_\Omega)$. Then Proposition 4.6 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{R^n}\|u - u_{B_R}\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^1(B_R))} \le \frac{1}{R^n}\|u - u_{Q_R}\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^1(B_R))} \\ &\le C\left(\frac{1}{R_0^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R_0^2,t_0);L^1(B_{R_0}))} + M\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} C\left(\frac{1}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-R_\Omega^2,t_0);L^1(B_{R_\Omega}))} + M\right), & \text{if } \ R_\Omega \le \min(\delta, \sqrt{t_0}) \\ C\left(\frac{1}{\delta^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((t_0-\delta^2,t_0);L^1(B_\delta))} + M\right), & \text{else if } \ \delta \le \min(\sqrt{t_0}, R_\Omega) \\ C\left(\frac{1}{R_0^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R_0^2);L^1(B_{R_0}))} + M\right), & \text{else } \quad t_0 = R_0^2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\le \begin{cases} \frac{C}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} + CM, & \text{if } \ R_\Omega \le \min(\delta, \sqrt{t_0}) \\ \frac{C}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} + CM, & \text{else if } \ \delta \le \min(\sqrt{t_0}, R_\Omega) \quad \text{by (4.8)} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} C\left(\frac{1}{\delta^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,\delta^2);L^1(B_\delta))} + M\right), & \text{else if } \ \delta \le R_\Omega \\ C\left(\frac{1}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,R_\Omega^2);L^1(B_{R_\Omega}))} + M\right), & \text{else if } \ \delta > R_\Omega \end{array} \right. & \text{(by Proposition 4.9)} \end{cases}$$

$$\le \frac{C}{R_\Omega^n}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} + CM, \quad \text{again by (4.8).}$$

So far we have proved (4.5). Once we note that $\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))} \le C\|f_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)}$, we derive (4.4) from (4.5).

Secondly, we prove the proposition for $0 < T < R_\Omega$. In this case, we consider the solution $\hat{u}$ of the equation

$$\frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (A\nabla \hat{u}) = \hat{f}_0 \tag{4.9}$$

in the domain $\Omega_{R_\Omega} = \Omega \times (0, R_\Omega)$ with the boundary and initial conditions $\hat{u} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \times (0, R_\Omega)$ and $\hat{u}(x, 0) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, where

$$\hat{f}_0(x,t) = \begin{cases} f_0(x,t), & \text{for } \ t \in (0,T), \\ 0, & \text{for } \ t \in (T, R_\Omega). \end{cases}$$

Check that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{f}_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_{R_\Omega})} \le C\|f_0\|_{L^{1,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}, \\ &\|\hat{f}_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_{R_\Omega})} \le C\|f_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_T)}, \\ &\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);\overline{\mathrm{BMO}})} \le \|\hat{u}\|_{L^\infty((0,R_\Omega);\overline{\mathrm{BMO}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C does not depend on T (as $T \to 0$). Then we apply the inequality (4.4) to $\hat{u}$ with $T = R_\Omega$. □

4.3 BMO estimates via $\mathcal{L}^{2,1}$

In this section, we present estimates for the solution of (4.2). The idea is similar as Section 4.2. From the proof of the following lemma we can see the main difference between the current subsection and the last subsection.

Lemma 4.8 *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < t_0 < T$. There exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ such that if u is the solution to* (4.2) *in $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times I_R$ with $I_R = (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, then*

$$\max_{t\in I_\rho} \|u - u_{Q_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} \le C\left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t \in I_R} \|u - \theta\|^2_{L^2(B_R)} + C\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}$$

holds for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{t_0})$ and any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, where C depends only on K and n.

Proof Let $\widetilde{B}_r = B_r(0)$, $\widetilde{I}_r = (-r^2, 0]$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}_r = \partial\widetilde{B}_r \times \widetilde{I}_r$. With any function w defined on Q_R, we associate a function $\tilde{\xi}(y, s) = \xi(x_0 + Ry, t_0 + R^2 s)$ defined on $\widetilde{Q}_1 := \widetilde{B}_1 \times \widetilde{I}_1$. Then $\tilde{u}$ is a solution of the equation

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A}\nabla_y \tilde{u}) = R\nabla_y \cdot \tilde{f}$$

in $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Let w be the solution of

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A}\nabla_y w) = R\nabla_y \cdot \tilde{f}$$

with the initial and boundary condition $w = 0$ on the parabolic boundary $\partial_{\mathrm{p}}\widetilde{Q}_1$. Multiplying the above equation by w and integrating the result over $\widetilde{Q}_1$, we obtain that

$$\|w\|_{L^\infty(\widetilde{I}_1; L^2(\widetilde{B}_1))} \leq CR\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\widetilde{Q}_1)}$$

On the other hand, we observe that $v = \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1} - w$ is the solution of

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial s} - \nabla_y \cdot (\tilde{A}\nabla_y v) = 0$$

in $\widetilde{Q}_1$. By the De Giorgi–Nash estimates of parabolic equations, we know that there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{t\in I_\rho} \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2\alpha_0}} \int_{\widetilde{B}_\rho} |v - v_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}|^2 \mathrm{d}y \\
&\leq C|v|^2_{C^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0/2}(\widetilde{Q}_{1/2})} \leq C\|v\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{Q}_1)} \leq C \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|v\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_\rho} \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_\rho)} \\
&\leq C \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_\rho} \|v - v_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_\rho)} + C \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_\rho} \|w - w_{\widetilde{Q}_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_\rho)} \\
&\leq C\rho^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|v\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)} + C \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|w\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)} \\
&\leq C\rho^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)} + C \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|w\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)} \\
&\leq C\rho^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_{\widetilde{Q}_1}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)} + CR^2\|\tilde{f}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{Q}_1)} \\
&\leq C\rho^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t\in\widetilde{I}_1} \|\tilde{u}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{B}_1)} + CR^2\|\tilde{f}\|^2_{L^2(\widetilde{Q}_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Transforming back to the (x, t)-coordinates, we complete the proof of the Lemma for $\theta = 0$.

Then we note that $u - \theta$ is also a solution to the equation (4.2) in Q_R for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. ☐

In a similar way, we can prove the following lemmas and propositions.

Lemma 4.9 *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $t_0 = 0$. There exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ such that if u is the solution of* (4.2) *in $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times \underline{I}_R$ with $\underline{I}_R = [0, R^2]$, then*

$$\max_{t \in \underline{I}_\rho} \|u\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} \le C \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t \in \underline{I}_R} \|u\|^2_{L^2(B_R)} + C\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}$$

holds for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{T})$, where C and α_0 depend only on K and n.

Lemma 4.10 *Let $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $t_0 > 0$. There exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ such that if u is the solution of* (4.2) *in $Q_R = B_R \times I_R$ with $B_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega$ and $I_R = (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, then*

$$\max_{t \in I_\rho} \|u\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} \le C \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t \in I_R} \|u\|^2_{L^2(B_R)} + C\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}$$

holds for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{t_0})$, where C and α_0 depend only on K, n and Ω.

Lemma 4.11 *Let $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $t_0 = 0$. There exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ such that if u is the solution to* (4.2) *in $Q_R = B_R \times \underline{I}_R$, with $B_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega$ and $\underline{I}_R = [0, R^2]$, then*

$$\max_{t \in \underline{I}_\rho} \|u\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} \le C \left(\frac{\rho}{R}\right)^{n+2\alpha_0} \max_{t \in \underline{I}_R} \|u\|^2_{L^2(B_R)} + C\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}$$

holds for any $0 < \rho \le R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{T})$, where C and α_0 depend only on K, n and Ω.

From the above lemmas, using Lemma 4.5 we can derive the following results concerning the solution of (4.2).

Proposition 4.12 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$ and $0 < \rho \le R \le \min\big(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{t_0}\big)$, we have*

$$\|u - u_{Q_\rho}\|^2_{L^\infty((t_0-\rho^2,t_0);L^2(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^2(B_R))} + \|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)\rho^n.$$

Proposition 4.13 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times [0, R^2]$ and $0 < \rho \le R \le \min\big(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{T}\big)$, we have*

$$\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((0,\rho^2);L^2(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((0,R^2);L^2(B_R))} + \|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)\rho^n.$$

Proposition 4.14 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$ and $0 < \rho < R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{t_0})$, we have*

$$\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((t_0-\rho^2,t_0);L^2(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((t_0-R^2,t_0);L^2(B_R))} + \|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)\rho^n.$$

Proposition 4.15 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times [0, R^2]$ and $0 < \rho < R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{T})$, we have*

$$\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((0,\rho^2);L^2(B_\rho))} \le C\left(\frac{1}{R^n}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty((0,R^2);L^2(B_R))} + \|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}\right)\rho^n.$$

With the above propositions and following the outline of Section 4.2, we can prove the global BMO estimate below.

Proposition 4.16 *The Propositions* 4.12–4.15 *imply that the solution of* (4.2) *satisfies that*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T);\overline{\mathrm{BMO}})} \leq C\|\vec{f}\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}, \tag{4.1}$$

where C depends only on K, n and Ω (independent of T).

5 Hölder estimate of parabolic equations

In this section, we list the propositions to be used in deriving (3.4). We omit the proof of these propositions, since it is very similar as the last section, The reason we keep these propositions in this section is that some of them are also used in the next section to prove global well-posedness of the degenerate thermistor problem.

There exist positive constants α_0 and C such that the following propositions hold.

Proposition 5.1 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, $0 < 2\rho \leq R \leq \min\big(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{t_0}\big)$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.1) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u - u_{Q_\rho}\|_{L^1(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u - \theta\|_{L^1(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+\alpha}}\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}\bigg),$$

where θ is an arbitrary constant.

Proposition 5.2 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times [0, R^2]$, $0 < \rho \leq R \leq \min\big(\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{T}\big)$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.1) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u\|_{L^1(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u\|_{L^1(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+\alpha}}\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

Proposition 5.3 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, $0 < \rho \leq R \leq \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{t_0})$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.1) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u\|_{L^1(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u\|_{L^1(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+\alpha}}\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

Proposition 5.4 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times [0, R^2]$, $0 < \rho \leq R \leq \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{T})$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.1) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u\|_{L^1(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+\alpha}}\|u\|_{L^1(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+\alpha}}\|f_0\|_{L^1(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

With the above propositions and following the outline of Section 4.2, we can derive the following estimate in terms of the Campanato space.

Proposition 5.5 *The solution of* (4.1) *satisfies that*

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^{1,1+\alpha/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} \leq C\|f_0\|_{L^{1,(n+\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}, \tag{5.1}$$

where C depends only on K, n and Ω (independent of T).

The local and global estimates in $\mathcal{L}^{2,\theta}_{\text{para}}(\Omega_T)$ follow in a similar way. To conclude, we have

Proposition 5.6 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, $0 < 2\rho \leq R \leq \min\big(\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{t_0}\big)$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.2) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}} \|u - u_{Q_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u - \theta\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+2\alpha}}\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg),$$

where θ is an arbitrary constant.

Proposition 5.7 *For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times [0, R^2]$, $0 < \rho \leq R \leq \min\big(\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega), \sqrt{T}\big)$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.2) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}} \|u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+2\alpha}}\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

Proposition 5.8 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, $0 < \rho < R \leq \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{t_0})$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.2) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}} \|u\|_{L^1(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+2\alpha}}\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

Proposition 5.9 *For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times [0, R^2]$, $0 < \rho \leq R \leq \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{T})$ and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, the solution of* (4.2) *satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}} \|u\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \leq C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+2\alpha}}\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

Proposition 5.10 *The solution of* (4.2) *satisfies that*

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}^{2,1+2\alpha/(n+2)}_{\text{para}}(\Omega_T)} \leq C\|\vec{f}\|_{L^{2,(n+2\alpha)/(n+2)}(\Omega_T)}, \tag{5.2}$$

where C depends only on K, n and Ω (independent of T).

Proposition 5.5 and Proposition 5.10 imply the global Hölder estimate (3.4).

6 The degenerate thermistor problem

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.2 concerning global well-posedness of the degenerate thermistor problem. Before we prove the theorem, we introduce some lemmas to be used.

6.1 Preliminaries

Lemma 6.1 *Let $p > 0$. If $u \in BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $u \geq 0$, and $C_1 + C_2|s|^p \leq \rho(s) \leq C_3 + C_4|s|^p$ for $s \geq 0$, then $\rho(u)$ is a A_2 weight in the sense that*

$$\bigg(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \rho(u)\mathrm{d}x\bigg)\bigg(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \frac{1}{\rho(u)}\mathrm{d}x\bigg) \leq C$$

for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where the constant C depends on C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, p and $\|u\|_{\text{BMO}}$.

Proof For any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we set $B_1 = \{x \in B \,|\, |u(x) - u_B| < \frac{1}{2}u_B\}$ and $B_2 = B \backslash B_1$. By the Nirenberg inequality [12] we have $|B_2|/|B| \le e^{-Cu_B/\|u\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}}$. Clearly, $\rho(u) \ge C\rho(u_B)$ on B_1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \rho(u)\mathrm{d}x &\le \frac{C}{|B|}\int_B (1 + |u - u_B|^p)\mathrm{d}x + \frac{C}{|B|}\int_B |u_B|^p \mathrm{d}x \\ &\le C + C|u_B|^p \le C\rho(u_B),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \frac{1}{\rho(u)}\mathrm{d}x &\le \frac{1}{|B|}\int_{B_1} \frac{1}{\rho(u)}\mathrm{d}x + \frac{C|B_2|}{|B|} \\ &\le \frac{C}{\rho(u_B)} + e^{-Cu_B/\|u\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}} \le \frac{C}{\rho(u_B)}.\end{aligned}$$

The last two inequalities imply that $\rho(u)$ is a A_2 weight. □

The following lemma concerns maximal regularity of parabolic equations, which is an application of the maximal regularity of [22] and [13] (with the perturbation method for the treatment of operators with merely continuous coefficients).

Lemma 6.2 *Let u be the solution of the parabolic problem* (3.1) *in $\mathbb{R}^n$ $(n = 2, 3)$ with the Dirichlet boundary/initial conditions $u \equiv g \equiv f_0 \equiv 0$, and assume that the coefficient matrix A is continuous. Then we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^p(I;W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \le C_{p,q}\|\vec{f}\|_{L^p(I;L^q(\Omega))}$$

for some $q > n$ and any $1 < p < \infty$. The constant $C_{p,q}$ depends only on p, q, K, the domain Ω and the modulo of continuity of A.

The analogus result for elliptic equations is given below, which can be proved by applying the $W^{1,q}$ estimate of [13] with a perturbation argument.

Lemma 6.3 *Let A_{ij}, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$, be continuous functions defined on Ω, satisfying*

$$K^{-1}|\xi|^2 \le \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \le K|\xi|^2, \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \ (n = 2, 3),$$

where K is a positive constant. Let u be the solution of the elliptic equation

$$-\nabla \cdot (A\nabla u) = \nabla \cdot \vec{f} \quad \text{in } \ \Omega,$$

with the Dirichlet boundary/initial conditions $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then we have

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \le C_q\|\vec{f}\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$$

for some $q > n$. The constant C_q depends only on q, Λ, the domain Ω and the modulo of continuity of A.

The following lemma is concerned with Hölder estimates for inhomogeneous parabolic equations [2], which is also a consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 6.4 *The solution of* (3.1) *with* $u_0 \equiv g \equiv 0$ *satisfies that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C(\|f_0\|_{L^p((0,T);L^q(\Omega))} + \|\vec{f}\|_{L^{2p}((0,T);L^{2q}(\Omega))}),$$

for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, *provided* $1 \le p, q \le \infty$ *and* $2/p + n/q < 2$.

The following lemma concerns an estimate of ∇u in the Morrey space for the parabolic equation (3.1), which was proved in [27] for $u_0 \equiv g \equiv f_0 \equiv 0$.

Lemma 6.5 *The solution of* (3.1) *with* $f_0 \equiv 0$ *satisfies that*

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} \le C(\|\vec{f}\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} + \|\partial_t g\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} + \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}).$$

6.2 Construction of approximating solutions

For the non-degenerate problem, the existence of a C^α solution was proved by Yuan and Lin [25, 26]. Based on their result, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a weak solution $(u^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)$ such that $\phi^\varepsilon \in L^\infty((0,T); H^1(\Omega))$ and $u^\varepsilon \in C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T) \cap L^2((0,T); H^1(\Omega))$, to the following equations

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\kappa(u^\varepsilon)\nabla u^\varepsilon) = \nabla \cdot [(\sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)\phi^\varepsilon \nabla \phi^\varepsilon] & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u^\varepsilon(x,0) = u_0(x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \big((\sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)\nabla \phi^\varepsilon\big) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \phi^\varepsilon = h & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

We also note that, by the maximum principle, the solution u^ε of (6.1) satisfies that

$$u^\varepsilon \ge c := \min\big(\min_{x\in\Omega} u_0(x), \min_{x\in\partial\Omega} g(x)\big) > 0, \tag{6.3}$$

and the solution ϕ of (6.2) satisfies that

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} \le \|h\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}. \tag{6.4}$$

By the hypotheses (H1)-(H2), we have

$$\kappa_0 \le \kappa(u^\varepsilon) \le \kappa_1, \qquad \varepsilon \le \sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \le 2\sigma_0 := \sup_{s\ge c} \sigma(s), \tag{6.5}$$

for some positive constants κ_0, κ_1 and σ_0, where we choose $\varepsilon < \sigma_0$.

Proposition 6.1 *The solution* $(u^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)$ *of* (6.1)-(6.2) *satisfies that*

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} + \|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^p((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t u^\varepsilon\|_{L^p((0,T);W^{-1,q}(\Omega))} + \|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \le C,$$

and

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{B}_R\times[0,T])} \le C_{\mathrm{dist}(\overline{B}_R,\partial\Omega)}$$

for any closed ball $\overline{B}_R \subset \Omega$, *where the constants* C *and* $C_{\mathrm{dist}(\overline{B}_R,\partial\Omega)}$ *are independent of* ε.

Proof First, we show that $\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon$ is a A_2 weight, uniformly with respect to time and ε.

Let $x_0 \in \Omega$, $t_0>0$ and let $R_0 = \frac{1}{2}\min(\sqrt{t_0}, \mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$. For any ball B_R of radius R centered at x_0, we let ζ be a smooth function defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfies $0 \le \zeta \le 1$, $\zeta = 1$ in B_R and $\zeta = 0$ outside B_{2R}. For any interval $I_R = (t_0 - R^2, t_0]$, we let χ be a smooth function defined on $\mathbb{R}$ which satisfies $0 \le \chi \le 1$, $\chi = 1$ on I_R and $\chi = 0$ on $(-\infty, t_0 - 4R^2]$. Let $Q_R = B_R \times I_R$ so that $(u^\varepsilon, \phi^\varepsilon)$ is a solution of (6.1)-(6.2) in Q_{2R_0}. Multiplying (6.2) by $\varphi = \phi^\varepsilon \zeta^2$, we obtain

$$\int_{B_R} (\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon)|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon|^2 \mathrm{d}x \le \int_{B_{2R}} (\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon)|\phi^\varepsilon|^2|\nabla\zeta|^2 \mathrm{d}x \le C\|\phi^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)} R^{n-2}.$$

Integrating the above inequality with respect to time and using (6.4), we get

$$\iint_{Q_R} (\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon)|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon|^2 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t \le C\|h\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} R^n. \tag{6.6}$$

Similarly, for $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 > 0$, $R < \frac{1}{2}\min(\sqrt{t_0}, R_\Omega)$, $B_R := B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega$ and $Q_R = Q_R(x_0, t_0) \cap \Omega_T$, we also have (6.6). From the last inequality we see that

$$\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\,\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} \le C. \tag{6.7}$$

By Theorem 3.1, the solution of (6.1) satisfies that

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T);\overline{\mathrm{BMO}})} \le C\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\,\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} + C\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + C\|g\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \le C. \tag{6.8}$$

Applying Lemma 6.5 to the equation (6.1) and using (6.7), we derive that

$$\|\nabla u^\varepsilon\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} \le C\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\,\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\mathrm{para}}(\Omega_T)} + C \le C. \tag{6.9}$$

We extend the function u^ε defined on Ω to $\mathbb{R}^n$ by setting $u^\varepsilon(x) = c$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega$ so that

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T);\mathrm{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^n))} \le C.$$

Since (3.5) holds, from Lemma 6.1 we see that $\rho(u^\varepsilon)$ (and also $\sigma(u^\varepsilon) = 1/\rho(u^\varepsilon)$) is a A_2 weight uniform with respect to time and ε. It follows that, for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B (\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}x\right)\left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \frac{1}{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}x\right)\\
&= \left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \sigma(u^\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}x\right)\left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \frac{1}{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}x\right) + \frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}x\\
&\le \left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \sigma(u^\varepsilon)\mathrm{d}x\right)\left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B \frac{1}{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)}\mathrm{d}x\right) + 1\\
&\le C,
\end{aligned}$$

which says that $\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon$ is also a A_2 weight, uniform with respect to time and ε.

Secondly, we estimate the Hölder norms of ϕ^ε and u^ε, respectively. In fact, from [10] we know that any solution of the elliptic equation (6.2) with the A_2 coefficient $\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon$ satisfies the Hölder estimates:

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})} \le C\|h^\varepsilon(\cdot,t)\|_{C^\alpha(\partial\Omega)} \le C, \quad \text{for } \ t\in(0,T), \quad \forall\ \alpha\in(0,\alpha_0), \tag{6.10}$$

for some fixed constant $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$.

We proceed to the Hölder estimate of u^ε. For any fixed $x_0 \in \Omega$, we decompose the function u^ε as $u^\varepsilon = u_1^\varepsilon + u_2^\varepsilon$, where u_1^ε and u_2^ε are weak solutions of the equations

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u_1^\varepsilon}{\partial t} - \nabla\cdot(\kappa(u^\varepsilon)\nabla u_1^\varepsilon) = 0 & \text{in } \ \Omega,\\ u_1^\varepsilon = g & \text{on } \ \partial\Omega,\\ u_1^\varepsilon(x,0) = u_0(x) & \text{for } \ x\in\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u_2^\varepsilon}{\partial t} - \nabla\cdot(\kappa(u^\varepsilon)\nabla u_2^\varepsilon) = \nabla\cdot\big[(\phi^\varepsilon-\phi^\varepsilon(x_0,t))(\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon)\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big] & \text{in } \ \Omega,\\ u_2^\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \ \partial\Omega,\\ u_2^\varepsilon(x,0) = 0 & \text{for } \ x\in\Omega, \end{cases}$$

respectively. By the De Giorgi–Nash–Moser estimates, we have

$$\|u_1^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C(\|g\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Gamma}_T)} + \|u_0\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})}).$$

and in order to estimate $\|u_2^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)}$, we set $\vec{f} = (\phi^\varepsilon - \phi^\varepsilon(x_0,t))(\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon)\nabla\phi^\varepsilon$ and apply Proposition 5.6–Proposition 5.9. We see that for $x_0\in\Omega$, $t_0>0$, $0<2\rho\le R\le \min\big(\mathrm{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega),\sqrt{t_0}\big)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon - (u_2^\varepsilon)_{Q_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)}\\ &\le C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon-\theta\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^{n+2\alpha}}\|\vec{f}\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg),\\ &\le C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon-\theta\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^n}\|\phi^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^\infty(I;C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega}))}\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg)\\ &\le C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon-\theta\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^n}\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $x_0\in\Omega$, $t_0=0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0)\times[0,R^2]$ and $0<\rho<R\le\min\big(\mathrm{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega),\sqrt{T}\big)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \le C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^n}\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

For $x_0\in\partial\Omega$, $t_0>0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega\times(t_0-R^2,t_0]$ and $0<\rho<R\le\mathrm{dist}(R_\Omega,\sqrt{t_0})$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \le C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}}\|u_2^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^n}\big\|\sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon)+\varepsilon}\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\big\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)}\bigg).$$

For $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 = 0$, $Q_R = B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega \times [0, R^2]$ and $0 < \rho < R \le \min(R_\Omega, \sqrt{T})$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\rho^{n+2+2\alpha}} \|u_2^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(Q_\rho)} \le C\bigg(\frac{1}{R^{n+2+2\alpha}} \|u_2^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} + \frac{1}{R^n} \big\| \sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon} \nabla\phi^\varepsilon \big\|^2_{L^2(Q_R)} \bigg).$$

Combining the last four inequalities and following the outline of Section 4.2, we can derive that

$$\|u_2^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}^{2,1+2\alpha/(n+2)}_{\text{para}}(\Omega_T)} \le C \big\| \sqrt{\sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon} \nabla\phi^\varepsilon \big\|_{L^{2,n/(n+2)}_{\text{para}}(Q_R)}.$$

With (6.7) and the equivalence relation $\mathcal{L}^{2,1+2\alpha/(n+2)}_{\text{para}}(\Omega_T) \cong C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)$, we see that

$$\|u_2^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C.$$

Therefore,

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le \|u_1^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} + \|u_2^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C. \tag{6.11}$$

Thirdly, we present $W^{1,q}$ estimates of ϕ^ε and u^ε. Note that the last inequality implies that

$$C^{-1} \le \sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \le C, \quad \|\sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C, \quad \|\kappa(u^\varepsilon)\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} \le C. \tag{6.12}$$

With the Hölder estimates of $\sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ and $\kappa(u^\varepsilon)$, we apply Lemma 6.2 – 6.3 and derive that

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \le C\|h\|_{L^\infty((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \le C, \tag{6.13}$$

$$\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^p((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} \le C_p\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L^p((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} + C_p \le C_p, \tag{6.14}$$

for some $q > n$ and any $1 < p < \infty$. From the equation (6.1) we also see that

$$\|\partial_t u^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(I;W^{-1,q}(\Omega))} \le C(\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^p((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))} + \|\nabla\phi^\varepsilon\|_{L^p((0,T);W^{1,q}(\Omega))}) \le C. \tag{6.15}$$

Finally, we estimate the interior space-time Hölder norm of ϕ^ε, which is used to obtain pointwise convergence of the approximating solutions in the next subsection. For the simplicity of notations, we set $A^\varepsilon = \sigma(u^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$. From (6.2) we see that

$$-\nabla \cdot \bigg(A^\varepsilon(x,t_1) \nabla[\phi^\varepsilon(x,t_1) - \phi^\varepsilon(x,t_2)] \bigg) = \nabla \cdot \bigg((A^\varepsilon(x,t_1) - A^\varepsilon(x,t_2)) \nabla\phi^\varepsilon(x,t_2) \bigg).$$

By applying the interior $W^{1,q}$ estimate to the above equation, we find that for any closed ball $\overline{B}_R$ contained in Ω there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^\varepsilon(x,t_1) - \phi^\varepsilon(x,t_2)\|_{L^\infty((0,T);W^{1,q}(B_R))} &\le C_{\text{dist}(\overline{B}_R,\partial\Omega)} \|A^\varepsilon(x,t_1) - A^\varepsilon(x,t_2)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} \\ &\le C_{\text{dist}(\overline{B}_R,\partial\Omega)} \|A^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)} |t_1 - t_2|^{\alpha/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which reduces to

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha/2}([0,T];W^{1,q}(B_R))} \le C_{\text{dist}(\overline{B}_R,\partial\Omega)}.$$

Since $W^{1,q}(B_R) \hookrightarrow C^\alpha(\overline{\Omega})$, the last inequality implie that

$$\|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{B}_R \times [0,T])} \le C_{\text{dist}(\overline{B}_R,\partial\Omega)}. \tag{6.16}$$

The proof of Proposition 6.1 is complete. □

6.3 Existence of solution

Since $C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)$ is compactly embedded into $C(\overline{\Omega}_T)$ and $C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{B}_R\times[0,T])$ is compactly embedded into $C(\overline{B}_R\times[0,T])$ there exist functions $u\in C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{\Omega}_T)$, $\phi\in L^\infty(I;W^{1,q}(\Omega))$ with $\phi\in C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(\overline{B}_R\times[0,T])$ for any closed ball $\overline{B}_R$ contained in Ω, and a sequence $\varepsilon_k\to 0$, such that u^{ε_k} converges to u in the norm of $C(\overline{\Omega}_T)$, u^{ε_k} converges weakly to u in $L^p(I;W^{1,q}(\Omega))$, $\partial_t u^{\varepsilon_k}$ converges weakly to $\partial_t u$ in $L^p(I;W^{-1,q}(\Omega))$, ϕ^{ε_k} converges weakly* to ϕ in $L^\infty(I;W^{1,q}(\Omega))$, and ϕ^{ε_k} converges to ϕ pointwise uniformly in each compact subset of $\Omega\times[0,T]$.

From (6.2) we see that

$$\int_\Omega(\sigma(u^{\varepsilon_k})+\varepsilon_k)\nabla\phi^{\varepsilon_k}\cdot\nabla\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x=0\quad\text{for any } \varphi\in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

By taking the limit $k\to\infty$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega\sigma(u)\nabla\phi\cdot\nabla\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x=0,\quad\text{for any } \varphi\in H_0^1(\Omega)\text{ and a.e. } t\in(0,T). \tag{6.17}$$

Therefore, for any function $v\in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega\nabla\cdot\Big(\phi^{\varepsilon_k}(\sigma(u^{\varepsilon_k})+\varepsilon_k)\nabla\phi^{\varepsilon_k}\Big)v\mathrm{d}x&=-\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega\phi^{\varepsilon_k}(\sigma(u^{\varepsilon_k})+\varepsilon_k)\nabla\phi^{\varepsilon_k}\cdot\nabla v\mathrm{d}x\\&=-\int_\Omega\phi\sigma(u)\nabla\phi\cdot\nabla v\mathrm{d}x\\&=-\int_\Omega\sigma(u)\nabla\phi\cdot[\nabla(\phi v)-v\nabla\phi]\mathrm{d}x\\&=\int_\Omega\sigma(u)|\nabla\phi|^2v\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

From (6.1) we know that for any $v\in L^\infty((0,T);C_0^\infty(\Omega))$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_\Omega\frac{\partial u^{\varepsilon_k}}{\partial t}v\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t+\int_0^T\int_\Omega\kappa(u^{\varepsilon_k})_{\varepsilon_k}\nabla u^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla v\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t\\&\qquad=\int_0^T\int_\Omega\nabla\cdot\Big(\phi^{\varepsilon_k}\frac{1}{\rho(u^{\varepsilon_k})_{\varepsilon_k}}\nabla\phi^{\varepsilon_k}\Big)v\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit $k\to\infty$, we get

$$\int_0^T\int_\Omega\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}v\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t+\int_0^T\int_\Omega\kappa(u)\nabla u\cdot\nabla v\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t=\int_0^T\int_\Omega\sigma(u)|\nabla\phi|^2v\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}t. \tag{6.18}$$

From the regularity of u and ϕ, we know that the equations (6.17)-(6.18) actually hold for any $\varphi\in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $v\in L^2((0,T);H_0^1(\Omega))$.

To conclude, we have proved the existence of a weak solution (u,ϕ) to the equations (1.1)-(1.3) with the regularity (3.6).

6.4 Uniqueness of solution

Suppose that (u_1, ϕ_1) and (u_2, ϕ_2) are two pairs of solutions to the initial-boundary value problem (1.1)-(1.3), both satisfying (3.6). Let $\bar{u} = u_1 - u_2$ and $\bar{\phi} = \phi_1 - \phi_2$. Then $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ are weak solutions to the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot (\kappa(u_1)\nabla \bar{u}) &= \nabla \cdot ((\kappa(u_1) - \kappa(u_2))\nabla u_2) \\ &\quad + (\sigma(u_1) - \sigma(u_2))|\nabla \phi_1|^2 + \sigma(u_2)\nabla(\phi_1 + \phi_2) \cdot \nabla \bar{\phi} \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

$$- \nabla \cdot (\sigma(u_1)\nabla \bar{\phi}) = \nabla \cdot \Big((\sigma(u_1) - \sigma(u_2))\nabla \phi_2\Big), \tag{6.20}$$

with the following boundary and initial conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{u}(x,t) = 0, \quad \bar{\phi}(x,t) = 0 && \text{for } \ x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t \in [0,T], \\ &\bar{u}(x,0) = 0 && \text{for } \ x \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

For any $\tau \in (0,T)$, we denote $I_\tau = (0,\tau)$ and $\Omega_\tau = \Omega \times I_\tau$. By applying Lemma 6.4 to the parabolic equation (6.19), we see that for $q > n$ there exists $1 < p < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} &\le C\|(\kappa(u_1) - \kappa(u_2))\nabla u_2\|_{L^p(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + C\|(\sigma(u_1) - \sigma(u_2))|\nabla \phi_1|^2\|_{L^p(I_\tau;L^{q/2}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + C\|\sigma(u_2)\nabla(\phi_1 + \phi_2) \cdot \nabla \bar{\phi}\|_{L^p(I_\tau;L^{q/2}(\Omega))} \\ &\le C\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)}\big(\tau^{1/2p}\|\nabla u_2\|_{L^{2p}(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))} + \|\nabla \phi_1\|^2_{L^{2p}(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))}\big) \\ &\quad + C\tau^{1/2p}\|\nabla(\phi_1 + \phi_2)\|_{L^\infty(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))}\|\nabla \bar{\phi}\|_{L^{2p}(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))} \\ &\le C\tau^{1/2p}\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} + C\tau^{1/2p}\|\nabla \bar{\phi}\|_{L^\infty(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C is independent of τ. With the Hölder regularity of u_1, by applying the $W^{1,q}$ estimates to (6.20), we obtain

$$\|\nabla \bar{\phi}\|_{L^\infty(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))} \le C\|(\sigma(u_1) - \sigma(u_2))\nabla \phi_2\|_{L^\infty(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))} \le C\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)}.$$

There exists T_0 such that for $\tau < T_0$, the last two inequalities imply that

$$\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\tau)} + \|\nabla \bar{\phi}\|_{L^\infty(I_\tau;L^q(\Omega))} = 0.$$

By dividing the interval $(0,T)$ into small parts $(T_k, T_{k+1}]$, $k = 0, 1, \cdots$, each part satisfying $T_{k+1} - T_k < T_0$, we find that $\bar{u}(\cdot, T_k) \equiv \bar{\phi}(\cdot, T_k) \equiv 0$ implies that $\bar{u}(\cdot, t) \equiv \bar{\phi}(\cdot, t) \equiv 0$ for $t \in [T_k, T_{k+1}]$. This proves the uniqueness of solution.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we proved global existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to the degenerate thermistor problem by establishing a uniform-in-time BMO estimate for parabolic equations with possibly discontinuous coefficients. The physical hypothesis (H1)-(H2) are satisfied by metals and some semiconductors. The BMO estimate of parabolic equations established in this paper may be applied to many other equations of mathematical physics.

References

[1] R.A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, New York, Academic Press, 1975.

[2] D.G. Aronson and J. Serrin, Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 25 (1967), pp. 81–122.

[3] G. Akrivis and S. Larsson, Linearly implicit finite element methods for the time dependent Joule heating problem, *BIT*, 45 (2005), pp. 429–442.

[4] W. Allegretto and H. Xie, Existence of solutions for the time-dependent thermistor equations, *IMA. J. Appl. Math.*, 48 (1992), pp. 271–281.

[5] W. Allegretto and N. Yan, A posteriori error analysis for FEM of thermistor problems, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.*, 3 (2006), pp. 413–436.

[6] S.N. Antontsev and M. Chipot, The thermistor problem: existence, smoothness, uniqueness, blowup, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 25 (1994) pp. 1128–1156.

[7] Y.Z. Chen, *Parabolic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order* (in Chinese), Beijing, Peking University Press, 2003.

[8] G. Cimatti, Existence of Weak Solutions for the Nonstationary Problem of the Joule Heating of a Conductor, *Annali di Matematica pura ed applicata*, 162 (1992), pp. 33–42.

[9] C.M. Elliott, and S. Larsson, A finite element model for the time-dependent joule heating problem, *Math. Comp.*, 64 (1995), pp. 1433–1453.

[10] E.B. Fabes, C.E. Kenig, and R.P. Serapioni, The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 7 (1982), pp. 77–116.

[11] A.E. Hachimi and M.R.S. Ammi, Existence of weak solutions for the thermistor problem with degeneracy, *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, Conference 09 (2002), pp. 127–137.

[12] L. Grafakos, *Classical and Modern Fourier Analysis*, China Machine Press, Beijing, 2005.

[13] D. Jerison and C.E. Kenig, *The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problems in Lipschitz Domains*, J. Func. Anal., 130 (1995), pp. 161–219.

[14] B. Li and W. Sun, Error analysis of linearized semi-implicit Galerkin finite element methods for nonlinear parabolic equations, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Modeling*, 10 (2013), pp. 622–633.

[15] B. Li and W. Sun, *Unconditionally optimal error estimates of a Crank–Nicolson Galerkin method for the nonlinear thermistor equations*, submitted.

[16] G.M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific Publishing, 1996, Singapore.

[17] E.D. Macklen, *Thermistors*, Electrochemical Publications Ltd, 1979.

[18] M.T.G. Montesinos and F.Q. Gallego, Existence of a capacity solution to a coupled nonlinear parabolic-elliptic system, *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 6 (2007), pp. 23–42.

[19] M.T.G. Montesinos and F.Q. Gallego, The evolution thermistor problem under the Wiedemann-Franz law with metallic conduction, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Series B*, 8 (2007), pp. 901–923.

[20] A. Sommerfeld, *Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics*, Academic Press, New York, 1964.

[21] G.M. Troianiello, *Elliptic Differential Equations and Obstacle Problems*, Plenum Press, New York, London, 1987.

[22] I. Wood, Maximal L^p-regularity for the Laplacian on Lipschitz domains, *Math. Z.*, 255 (2007), pp. 855–875.

[23] X. Xu, Partial regularity of solutions to a class of degenerate systems, *Tran. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 349 (1997), pp. 1973–1992.

[24] X. Xu, On the existence of bounded tempeature in the thermistor problem with degeneracy, *Nonlinear Analysis*, 42 (2000), pp. 199–213.

[25] G. Yuan and Z. Liu, Existence and uniqueness of the C^α solution for the thermistor problem with mixed boundary value, *Applicable Analysis*, 53 (1994), pp. 149–156.

[26] G. Yuan, Regularity of solutions of the thermistor problem, *Applicable Analysis*, 53 (1994), pp. 149–156.

[27] H. Yin, $L^{2,\mu}(Q)$ *estimates for parabolic equations and applications*, preprint.

[28] S. Zhou and D.R. Westbrook, Numerical solutions of the thermistor equations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 79 (1997), pp. 101–118.

[29] J.M. Ziman, *Electrons and Phonons*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1960.